UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,) Case No.: 2:16-cr-00265-GMN-CWH-22
VS.	ORDER
MATHEW KEITH DUNLAP,))
Defendant.))
))

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable United States Magistrate Carl W. Hoffman, (ECF No. 1386), which states that Defendant Mathew Keith Dunlap's Motion to Dismiss Counts Six, Seven, Eight, Nine, and Ten of the Superseding Indictment Pursuant to 18 U.S.C.S. § 3282, (ECF No. 1001), should be denied.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

1	Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.
2	Accordingly,
3	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 1386), is
4	ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Dunlap's Motion to Dismiss Counts Six,
6	Seven, Eight, Nine, and Ten of the Superseding Indictment Pursuant to 18 U.S.C.S. § 3282,
7	(ECF No. 1001), is DENIED .
8	DATED this 28 day of December, 2018.
9	
10	
11	Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge United States District Court
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	